

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/575,514	04/13/2006	Gerald Lauer	2003P12200WOUS	3910		
22116 SIEMENS CO	7590 11/26/200 RPORATION	EXAM	EXAMINER			
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT			BASICHA	BASICHAS, ALFRED		
170 WOOD A ISELIN, NJ 08	VENUE SOUTH	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
,			3743	•		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			11/26/2008	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/575,514	LAUER, GERALD	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Alfred Basichas	3743	

	/ linea Basienas	0740					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 04 November 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
∑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of thi application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (f) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 4.1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.						
<ul> <li>The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to</li> </ul>	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejectio	n.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(I	).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date whave been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of valunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (a) above, if checket. Any reply re-ceived by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	of the date of appeal. Since				
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	v);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (f	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•					
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</li> </ol>		ll be entered and an ex	planation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attache	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:							
	/Alfred Basichas/						
	Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 3743					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant asserts that Takahara does not teach a first and second portion distribution of the fuel, but that Takahara merely teaches injecting fuel into premixture duct 55. Nevertheless, applicant is ignoring ports 56 that clearly distribute distinct portions of the fuel (see at least fig. 2)

Applicant further asserts that Takahara does not show the second portion of the mixture injected generally perpendicular to a direction of a hot combustion gas flowing away from the circulating mixture. As shown in figure 2 of Takahara the circulating mixture is shown by flows e and f. The hot combustion gas will inherently continue to the right where the middle and rightmost ports 56 are shown to direct the second portion of the fuel in a direction that is generally perpendicular to the direction of the flow of hot combustion gases.

Applicant further asserts that Takahara fails to recite the claimed range. Nevertheless, as recited in the rejection, Takahara clearly recites 20%, which falls into both ranges (see at least col. 2, lines 47-50).